REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15, and 19-29 are pending and rejected in the application. Claims 16-18 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 3-11, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-2, 3-11, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,565 (hereinafter Demos-565). Claims 1-15 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demos-565 in view of Adobe Dynamic Media Group, "A Digital Video Primer," (June 2000) (hereinafter Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,203 (hereinafter Demos-203).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-2, 3-11, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-2, 3-11, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-15 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demos-565 in view of Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group and further in view of Demos-203.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) states:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter **as a whole** would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

It is well established in the case law and apparent from a literal interpretation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) that an obviousness analysis must focus on the claimed invention as a whole, and not on the individual elements that comprise the invention. *See eg. Custom Accessories Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Industries*, Inc., 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1196 (Fed. Cir. 1986) ("Casting an invention as 'a combination of old elements' leads improperly to an analysis of the claimed invention by the parts, not by the whole.").

In rejecting applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner has not looked at the claims as a whole but rather has attempted to find the various elements in various references. Examiner has found a part of Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group that he asserts teaches "resizing each full frame to produce a plurality of frames that are antialiased," but the plain language of applicants' claim shows that the "full frame" must first be rendered in a specific way. Neither Demos-565, Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group, nor a combination of the two, teaches or even suggests rendering the frames as claimed by the applicants and then resizing those claims as taught by applicants.

Applicants assert that the references put forth by Examiner do not teach the elements of applicants' invention, but even assuming *arguendo* that they do, the fact that examiner has found all the elements in various references does not render applicants' invention obvious. The examiner has failed to show that the references, either individually or in combination, teach applicants' claimed method as a whole because the Examiner has not given and the references do not contain any motivation to combine the various elements into the method that applicants claim.

In addition to there being no motivation to combine, Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group does not teach the elements of applicants' claims that examiner asserts it does. Adobe-Dynamic-Media-Group merely provides an overview of various functions that can be performed with desktop software. Examiner has attempted to read Applicants' claimed invention on Adobe-Dynamic-Media-Group by finding random functions of various software packages that teach the individual elements of claim 1, but Adobe-Dynamic-Media-Group contains no support for piecing any of these various functions into a method.

For example, Adobe-Dynamic-Media-Group points out that resizing can be performed with desktop software, but it does not teach resizing as being a step in a method. The wording of Applicants' claim makes it clear that resizing is a step of a method and is being done to frames that have been previously rendered "at a whole number multiple of a digital video resolution value defining the number of pixels contained in each frame and at a whole number multiple of a temporal resolution value defining the rate of display of full frames on a computer screen." The section of Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group cited by Examiner does not link the resizing of the frames to the rendering of the frames which is necessary in order to teach the method of claim 1.

Similarly, Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group does not teach "blending each consecutive frame" in the context of a method. The section cited by Examiner reads as follows:

> There are three different frame types in MPEG-2. These are known as I, P, and B frames. I stands for "intraframe" encoding and works just like a DV frame of video. The P frame is a "predicted" frame. It is compounded from the frames previous to it. B is for "bi-directional" frame. This means that not only is the B frame computed from previous frames, it can also use frames that come after it. More data must be preserved to describe I frames, making them the "largest," whereas P frames can be less than a tenth of that size. B frames are the smallest. Because the P and B frames are calculated from the I frames, you can't just have one I frame and the rest P's and B's. There must be I frames interspersed or else the accumulated error becomes too great and the image quality suffers.

This does not teach blending consecutive frames that have been rendered and resized as recited in claim 1. Adobe-Dynamic-Media-Group makes no mention of how the frames were rendered or that the frames were resized before being converted to I, B, and P frames. As with the other elements of claim 1, Examiner is taking random pieces of the reference and reading them on the claims' elements but is ignoring the fact that these pieces are not arranged in the same manner as in the claim and do not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice Applicants' invention; both of which are necessary requirements to render a claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Additionally, Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group does not teach the claim element of "blending each consecutive frame" at all, but rather teaches MPEG-2 video compression. The I, P, B format of MPEG-2 does not rely on blending frames. Instead it uses intraframes (I), predicted frames (P), and bi-directional frames (B). I frames contain all the data of a full frame. P and B frames contain data needed to modify another I, P, or B frame, and therefore contain substantially less data than an I frame. The majority of frames in any given sequence are going to be extremely similar to the frames before and after so it is unnecessary for every frame to contain redundant data, which would be the

case if every frame were an I frame. MPEG-2 compression works by eliminating redundant data, which is completely different from blending. It is therefore incorrect of examiner to assert that Adobe-Dynamics-Media-Group teaches "blending each consecutive frame."

In light of the foregoing arguments, applicants assert that independent claims 1 and 2 are allowable, and claims 3-15 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims. It is respectfully requested that rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Demos-565. Applicants have amended claim 19 to incorporate the same limitations that make independent claims 1 and 2 patentable. For the same reasons as stated above, neither Demos-565 nor Demos-565 combined with other cited art, teaches or renders obvious applicants' invention.

For all the above reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600.**

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: June 27, 2006 By: _____

Jeffrey R. Joseph
(Reg. No. 54,204)
Attorney for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501